Copy of a letter from Wm. P. Hort to David Bradford, transmitted ~~dated~~ by the latter to the Director of the Mint U.S.

"Assayer's office, 25 april, 1839.

David Bradford, Esq.
Supt. U. S. Mint.
N. O.

Sir,

When invited by you yesterday to meet the officers of the Mint for the purpose of investigating a certain affair which has transpired in the Treasurer's Office, I felt it my duty to decline your proposition from a sense of propriety & decorum. — You are aware Sir, that there is one of the officers ~~with~~ whom I cannot personally deliberate on any business, who is always thrown into a violent paroxysm of passion, whenever I happen to differ with him in opinion, & whose language under this excitement is ungentlemanly, overbearing, insulting & discourteous. At the same time I was as anxious as any of the officers to investigate the affair, & have alone in my office attentively & patiently considered all the facts of the case, & now have the honor to submit my opinion. It is evident that unless the numbers stamped on the bullion which has been melted by the Melter & Refiner previous to its being assayed, correspond with the numbers of the deposites in the weighing-book, it is impossible for the Assayer to identify any deposite when called on to make the assays. Confusion & error must inevitably result. On the contrary no difficulty whatever can exist when the numbers correspond, & when if there happens to be more than one melt in a deposit, the different melts are countermarked 1. 2. 3 &c. One number, say 99 identifies one deposit with the entry in the weigh-

2 ing-book, and the countermarking makes evident the number & succession of melts.

On Saturday April 20th I was called to assay three deposits. I found two portions of bullion, each marked No. 99 & countermarked 1, said to be one deposite, the first a melt of Mexican dollars— the second of French Crowns. No. 100 was pointed out to me as the second deposit, & No. 101 as the third. What reason had I to doubt that there were three deposits before me, as I saw the three numbers ~~of~~ 99, 100 & 101, which corresponded with the entries in the weighing book. Again altho' both parcels of bullion pointed out to me as the two melts of No. 99 were countermarked 1 & 1 instead of 1 & 2, I thought it was an oversight of the marker; & as the difference of weight & size identified the two separate parcels, I was satisfied with the explanation I received. But now I am told that No. 100 is the second melt of deposit 99. If so, I ask why was it so marked, & how could it do otherwise than mislead the Assayer? The deposite in the weighing book has but the one number 99, but according to the above system of marking, every thing is thrown into inevitable confusion. I have however no hesitation in saying that ~~as~~ it requires the two numbers 99 & No. 100 to make the weight of the said deposit, there can be no doubt but that No. 100 belongs to that deposit, & represents the melt of French Crowns, & that consequently the deposit of Damian Casas which I had supposed to be assayed, & for which I have given a certificate, is missing. I have after repeated assays found a difference of 1 Ht to exist between the two parcels of bullion marked 99 & said to be one melt. There appears from my report to be a difference of 2 Ht, because I deducted as is customary for the benefit of the M & R, 1 Ht from the largest melt. No. 100 gave by actual assay 896, but I returned it 895, consequently by striking out the entry in my book, accompanied by an explanatory note, the error will be rectified so far as I am concerned. I have however to request that my report of Damian Casa's deposit be returned to me. The Melter & Refiner then, as the titles of the supposed second melt of 99 & of 100, happened to be exactly alike, will experience no difficulty & sustain no loss by taking them as they now stand Nos. 1 & 1 of 99 at 894 & No. 100 at 896.

My opinion then is that the Melter & Refiner is clearly exonerated & sustained in one of his positions in reference to Casas' deposit, & that the error exists in the Treasurer's department. That the irregular numbering *inevitabl*y lead me into error, & most probably produced the mistake in the Treasurer's department. But that in reference to the other position of the Melter & Refiner, that he never melted the said deposit of Casas, I am inclined to believe that he did receive & melt that deposite, because how otherwise would the weight *after melting* appear on the weighing book.

Furthermore I am constrained to say that I firmly believe that the Melter & Refiner has repeatedly endeavored to lead me into error, so as to afford ground for accusation, & my dismissal from Office. I have ample testimony to establish this point, but will select a single case by way of illustration:- In the month of July last when Mr. Lillie was a Clerk in the Treasurer's office there occurred great irregularity & confusion in the entries in the silver weighing-book - I fortunately discovered it, & requested Mr. Duel the Chief-Clerk to speak to the M & R on the subject - his reply was that he had nothing to do with it, & that I might find it out as I could! -

Respectfully yrs.
(Signed) Wm. P. Hort, Assr.

I certify that the within is a true copy of the letter of Wm. P. Hort, on file in the Office of the Director of the Mint of the United States, as received May 24, 1839.

Geo. F. Dunning,
Director's Clerk.

U. S. Mint, Aug. 17, 1839.

Copy of an extract from a letter from Wm. P. Hort to David Bradford, transmitted to the Director of the Mint U. S., by Mr. Bradford, in a letter of May 16th, 1839

No. II.

The hammered dollars of Tichenor's deposit No. 99, weighed 321 oz. an amount of silver that the moulds will easily contain. It is worthy of remark then that they were divided into two parcels of bullion. It was unnecessary, as it cannot be supposed that either the Melter & Refiner or his workmen are ignorant on this subject. It would seem to have been done designedly to embarrass, particularly when it is recollected that the second melt of that deposit, consisting as it was then supposed of French Crowns, was marked 100, the number of Casas' deposit on the weighing book, whilst the two parcels of bullion resulting from the melt of Ham.d Dollars were marked 99.

My attention is now called to the French Crowns. And what has become of them? In Philadelphia and here, they have always averaged 909 m. whilst the Bullion returned by the M. & R. as being those Crowns gave the title after repeated assays of 896 – the average standard of Mexican Dollars. Tichenor who made the deposite is a Porter in the Merchant's Bank, & is considered by the Money Brokers as second to no one as a judge of coins; the idea of these having been Counterfeit crowns is very improbable, & there must have been many to make a difference of 13 m on so small a deposit as 110 oz. The cash in the Treasurer's Office has been balanced, & has been found to be right. The entries of weighing, reweighing & delivery to the M. & R. of Casas' deposit, are to be found in the Treasurer's books, & moreover on the M. & R's own book, a decisive fact, of which I was not aware when I wrote my first letter. But again, after these entries had been made in the Weighing-book, & in the M. & R's books, I am informed that the M. & R., aware that he was charged with Casas' deposit, stated to Mr. Dimety one day, that he ought to have a certain specified amount of bullion in the vault. Mr. D. proposed to weigh it, he was aided in the process by the M & R. & the result accorded within two or three ounces with the M & R's calculation. It is evident that his calculation ~~that his calculation~~ must have been based on the entries in the Weighing-book, & seeing those entries, would he not have included Casas' deposit in the amount specified, if he had not received it? To my mind a certain conclusion that he did receive it.

From the consideration of these new facts, I am of opinion that the M & R has received Casas' & Tichenor's deposits, & that the Mexican dollars, * ~~that the~~ of Casas' deposit took the place, by design or inadvertently, I pretend not to say, of the French Crowns, & that the French Crowns have never been assayed, that they have disappeared, and probably have gone into the pot with other bullion, a mistake that might easily occur when clippings are being melted, & when there are so many small deposits as we have had lately.

Respectfully yrs.
(signed) Wm. P. Hort,
Marked (A copy.) Assayer.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an extract from a letter of Wm. P. Hort, on file in the office of the Director of the Mint of the U. S. as received May 24. 1839.

Geo. F. Dunning,
U. S. Mint, Aug. 17, 1839. Director's Clerk.